Lovelady shirt HW 6/26/75

In about 11/66 I made a close study of the actual Oswald shirt. I also obtained color pictures of it for Jones Harris. I studied this shirt under natural north light and under fluorescent light

This is a short unlike any I can remember. It was patched as one used to darn stockings (or can't you remember that). It had pronounced defects not all of which I remember. I have a memo you can read when you ate here.

My impression is that it was the hand-me-down of a once expensive shirt that LHO used as a wrokshort.

It reminded me of the grass-type wallpaper. It is not a short woven of a solid material, like broadcloth, Nor was it actually rust brown. It had a pronounced glittering fibre, as I recall sort of glod colored.

Most telling to me there was the absence of means of holding the shirt closed where the shirt on the man in the doorway is not closed. Buttonholes were enlarged, etc.

I was also disturbed by the handling of the entire matter. Why, for example, did the FBI lie about Lovelady's shirt?

Impressive was the description Mrs. Lovelady gave me when she read WWII and phoned the Saturday afternoon before it went to press. She was looking for $5,000, a sum she could not hope to get via any kind of fakery.

I'm too tired to dig out the old files and notes. I have only a few more comments.

Robert has done no real work on this. He has merely reproduced a few frames from the DCA collection. In magnification, I think it inevitable they represent a considerably greater enlargement from standard 8 than the enlarging of the 35mm Altgens represents. Martin was, as I recall, using a regular camera. No zoom. Altgens was using a 105. The quality of the lenses I am sure is greatly in Altgens' favor.

If in addition the area of the Altgens film is about 12 times that of Martin's, then the greater enlarging problem is not with Altgens. Was he not also closer?

So, if the pattern shows as clearly as it does in Martin, why should we then assume it would shoe less clearly in Altgens? Hastily, HW